

66

July 16, 1940.

SUGGESTIONS RELATIVE TO FORM, ORGANIZATION,
AND CONTENT OF FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY REPORTS.

The experience which survey personnel have had in conducting detailed surveys has brought out a wealth of methods of carrying on flood control investigations. The writing of reports of these surveys likewise has brought out various desirable forms and contents in presenting these reports. The review and revision of the Los Angeles Report has recently been completed, and it is believed that sending a copy of it and a few comments on it may be of assistance to the field in organizing and writing the reports that are at present being worked on in the field. The following preliminary statements are based on experience which the Report Review Subcommittee have had in connection with revision of the reports submitted to date. Further suggestions will be sent to the field from time to time, based upon review of additional reports. A copy of the Los Angeles Report is herewith submitted as illustrative of some of the desirable features which should be embodied in reports. Because of the special nature of the problem in the Los Angeles watershed, the Los Angeles Report cannot, however, be used in all respects as a guide to the writing of other watershed reports.

The following is a partial list of essential features and characteristics of all survey reports:

1. The report should carry a brief summary of recommendations such as are included on pages 1 to 3 of the Los Angeles report.
2. The report should also carry a tabular summary of the program. (See pages 104 to 106 of the Los Angeles Report) It is essential that tables of this sort be included in each survey report. It would be preferable, however, if other reports provided for contingencies by making more liberal cost estimates instead of asking for a separate contingency fund, as was done in this case. In case a definite sum is added to the cost estimates to take care of contingencies, this sum should be kept separate somewhere in the work sheets or data files, and an itemized statement of the added amounts, together with a brief explanation of how each item was estimated, submitted to Washington along with the report so that it can be reviewed.
3. The report should carry a summarized and tabular statement of costs and benefits of each proposed remedial measure or group of measures as is shown in Table 10 (pages 94 and 95 of the Los Angeles Report), and a summarized statement of the different kinds and amounts of benefits that will result from the proposed program as shown on page 90.

4. A statement of the administrative facilities for executing the program should be a part of the report. (Pages 55-6 and 71-9 of the Los Angeles Report) For example, if a group of proposed measures is to be carried out by farmers subject to a cooperative agreement with a Soil Conservation District, the Department of Agriculture supplying technical services, planting stock, equipment, etc., this should be definitely stated. If, on the other hand, certain measures are to be installed by some branch of the Federal Government on public land, that, in turn, should be indicated. In short, the report should be definite about how the proposed measures will be installed.
5. The Report should contain a statement of the cost of each measure or group of measures segregated by administrative channels as well as by source of funds. For example, the cost of a group of measures such as contour furrowing, range fencing, deferred grazing, and range reseeding, to be undertaken by farmers on their own land with the Government supplying only technical services and supervision, should be distinguished from the cost of a similar group of measures to be undertaken by the Government on publicly owned land.
6. In order to determine the proper administrative channels and to segregate the cost of the program as called for under Items 4 and 5 above, the report should differentiate, by map, between areas unsuited to future agricultural use, such as blocks of non-farm forest land, and areas suited to farming.

In making such differentiation, maps made in connection with the intensive county land use plans prepared by County Agricultural Land Use Planning Committees, and approved both by the State Land Use Planning Committee and by the Department of Agriculture, should be utilized wherever they are available. Where the map prepared by the survey is in disagreement with intensive county land use maps not yet finally approved in Washington, the survey should base the remedial program on its own map. This disagreement, however, should be called to the attention of Washington for further consideration. Where county land use plans are not available, the assistance of County Agricultural Land Use Planning Committees should be sought in delineating the two major types of areas.

The separation of these two types of areas will then make it possible to prepare separate remedial programs for each and will provide a better basis for determining the

conditions under which the Government will undertake to spend money in treating privately owned land. In general, it will be unwise for the Government to expend money in treating any kind of private land, whether agricultural, forest, abandoned, or other wild land, until some assurance of future protection and maintenance is received from legally responsible local or State agencies.

Provision should be made, where necessary, in survey work outlines and detailed work plans, to cover this item.

7. Experience in revision of some of the reports which have been received indicates also the need for uniform figures on the total area of land in the watershed and the necessary subdivisions of it. Figures giving the acreage of land in farms, land in crops, land to be treated, and so on, should be consistent throughout the report. Figures derivable by multiplying the average size farm by the number of farms should be consistent with the total acreage of land in farms given elsewhere.
8. The body of the report should not be overloaded with detailed technical discussions, tables, charts, etc. Detailed discussions showing the technical methods employed in making the determinations necessary for the report should be carried in the appendices to the main report.

The above suggestions have the approval of the Flood Control Advisory Committee and the Office of Land Use Coordination, and are for application by field survey personnel.

